

# **The Weaponization of Nature: A Historical Context and Urgent Warning**

22min-Dr David Martin may2023 at International Covid Summit III - European Parliament\_ It is Genocide!.mp3

## **Chapters**

Timestamp   Summary

0:00:17 Introduction and warning about weaponization of nature

0:01:39 Opportunity for a public conversation on biological patents

0:03:12 Historical context of coronavirus research and patents

0:08:02 Pfizer's spike protein vaccine patent in 1990

0:09:31 Vaccines do not work on coronavirus

0:11:19 SARS 1.0 was engineered, not naturally occurring

0:14:05 RTPCR test identified as bioterrorism threat in 2002

0:15:28 \$10 billion funneled through black operations for gain of function research

0:17:05 Premeditation of accidental or intentional release of respiratory pathogen

0:18:55 Admission of financial fraud and domestic terrorism in 2015

## **Transcript**

0:00:17

It is a particularly interesting location for me to be sitting today, given that over a decade ago, I sat in this very share right here in the European Union Parliament. And at that time I warned the world of what was coming. During that conversation that was hosted at the time by the Green and EFA and a number of the other parties of the European Union's, various representations. We were having a conversation on whether Europe should adopt the United States policy of allowing for the patents on biologically derived materials.

0:00:58

And at the time, I urged this body, and I urged people around the world that the weaponization of nature against humanity had dire consequences. Tragically, I sit here today with that unfortunate line that I don't like to say, which I told you so, but the fact of the matter is we're here not for a reprisal on past decisions. We're here to actually once again come to the face of the human condition and ask the question, who do we want to be?

0:01:39

What do we want humanity to look like? And rather than seeing this as an exercise in futility, which is very easy from time to time, when you're in the position I'm in, I actually see this not as an exercise in futility. I see this as one of the greatest opportunities that faces us, because we now have a public conversation which is now front and center in people's minds. When this was an esoteric conversation about biological patents, nobody cared.

0:02:07

But when that conversation came home, then it became something people can care about. So I'm actually quite grateful for this opportunity. I thank the members of Parliament for hosting this. I thank all of the translators who I apologize in advance. I will use terminology that is probably very difficult to translate, so my apologies. I'd also like to acknowledge the fact that many of you are aware of my involvement with this.

0:02:34

In large part due to the amazing work of my wonderful wife, Kim Martin, who encouraged me at the very early days. Of this pandemic to get on front of the camera and talk about all the information that I had been sharing among very small groups around the world. And it was, in fact, her encouragement that put me in a place where many of you have heard what I have to say. Ironically, the world that I came from that used to be very popular. My CNBC and Bloomberg presentations, which were televised on mainstream media around the world, was an audience that I lost.

0:03:12

I can confidently say COVID diminished my fame, but I can also confidently say that I'd rather stand among the people with whom I'm standing today than any of the

folks that were part of that previous world. So this is a much better place to be. My role today is to set the stage for this conversation in a historical context, because this did not come in the last three years. This did not come in the last five or six years. This actually is an ongoing question that probably began here in Europe in the early stages of the mid 19 hundreds. But certainly by 1913, 1914, this conversation started right here in Central Europe.

0:03:58

The pandemic that we alleged to have happen in the last few years also did not happen overnight. In fact, the very specific pandemic using coronavirus began in a very different time. We'll try to advance the slides here with one of these things. There we go. Most of you don't know that coronavirus as a model of a pathogen was isolated in 1965. Coronavirus was identified in 1965 as one of the first infectious replicatable viral models that could be used to modify a series of other experiences of the human condition. It was isolated once upon a time associated with the common cold.

0:04:53

But what's particularly interesting about its isolation in 1965 was that it was immediately identified as a pathogen that could be used and modified for a whole host of reasons. And you heard me correctly, that was 1965. And by the way, these slides are public domain. You're welcome to look at every single reference. Every comment that I made is based on published material, so do make sure that you look at those references.

0:05:19

But in 1966, the very first CoV coronavirus model was used as a transatlantic biological experiment in human manipulation. And you heard the date 1966. I hope you're getting the point of what I'm saying. This is not an overnight thing. This is actually something that's been long in the making. A year before I was born, we had the first transatlantic coronavirus data sharing experiment between the United States and the United Kingdom.

0:05:56

And in 1967, the year I was born, we did the first human trials on inoculating people with modified coronavirus. Isn't that amazing? 56 years ago, the overnight success of

a pathogen that's been 56 years in engineering. And I want that to chill with all of you. Where were we when we actually allowed, in violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties? Where were we as a human civilization when we thought it was an acceptable thing to do to take a pathogen for the United States and infect the world with it?

0:06:35

Where was that conversation and what should have been that conversation in 1967? That conversation wasn't had. Ironically, the common cold was turned into a chimera in the 1970s. And in 1970, 519, 76 and 1977, we started figuring out how to modify coronavirus by putting it into different animals, pigs and dogs. And not surprisingly, by the time we got to 1990, we found out that coronavirus as an infectious agent was an industrial problem for two primary industries the industries of dogs and pigs.

0:07:20

Dog breeders and pigs found that coronavirus created gastrointestinal problems and that became the basis for Pfizer's first spike protein vaccine patent filed. Are you ready for this? In 1990. Did you hear what I just said? 1990. Operation warp speed. I'm sorry, where's the warp and the speed? Pfizer 1990, the very first spike protein vaccine for coronavirus. Isn't that fascinating? Isn't it fascinating that we were told that, well, the spike protein is a new thing? We just found out that that's the problem.

0:08:02

No, as a matter of fact, we didn't just find out. It was not just now the problem. We found that out in 1990 and filed the first patents on vaccines in 1990 for the spike protein of coronavirus. And who would have thought? Pfizer clearly the innocent organization that does nothing but promote human health. Clearly pfizer the organization that has not bought the votes in this chamber, in every chamber of every government around the world.

0:08:33

Not that Pfizer, certainly they wouldn't have had anything to do with this, but oh yes they did. And in 1990 they found out that there was a problem with vaccines. They didn't work. You know why they didn't work? It turns out that coronavirus is a very malleable model. It transforms and it changes and it mutates over time. As a matter

of fact, every publication on vaccines for coronavirus from 1990 until 2018, every single publication concluded that coronavirus escapes the vaccine impulse because it modifies and mutates too quickly for vaccines to be effective. And since 1990 to 2018, that is the published science, ladies and gentlemen, that's following the science.

0:09:31

Following the science is their own indictment of their own programs. That said, it doesn't work. And there are thousands of publications to that effect, not a few hundred and not paid for by pharmaceutical companies. These are publications that are independent scientific research that shows unequivocally, including efforts of the chimera modifications made by Ralph Barrick in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. All of them show vaccines do not work on coronavirus.

0:10:05

That's the science. And that science has never been disputed. But then we had an interesting development in 2002. And this date is most important because in 2002, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill patented, and I quote, an infectious replication defective clone of coronavirus. Listen to those words infectious replication defective. What does that phrase actually mean? For those of you not familiar with language, let me unpack it for you.

0:10:41

Infectious replication defective means a weapon. It means something meant to target an individual but not have collateral damage to other individuals. That's what infectious replication defective means. And that patent was filed in 2002 on work funded by NIAID's Anthony Fauci from 1999 to 2002. And that work, patented at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, mysteriously preceded SARS 1.0 by a year.

0:11:19

Dave, are you suggesting that SARS 1.0 wasn't from a wet market in Wuhan? Are you suggesting it might have come from a laboratory in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill? No, I'm not suggesting it. I'm telling you that's the facts we engineered SARS. SARS is not a naturally occurring phenomenon. The naturally occurring phenomenon is called the common cold. It's called influenza like illness. It's called gastroenteritis. That's the naturally occurring coronavirus.

0:11:55

SARS is the research developed by humans weaponizing a life system model to actually attack human beings. And they patented it in 2002. And in 2003, giant surprise, the CDC filed the patent on Coronavirus, isolated from humans, in violation once again of biological and chemical weapons. Treaties and laws that we have in the United States, and I'm very precise on this United States likes to talk about its rights and everything else and the rule of law and all the nonsense that we like to talk about, but we don't ratify treaties about, I don't know, defending humans.

0:12:40

We conspicuously avoid that. We actually have a great track record of advocating for human rights and then denying them when it comes to actually being part of the international community, which is a slightly problematic thing. But let's get something very clear. When the CDC, in April of 2003, filed the patent on SARS coronavirus isolated from humans, what did they do? They downloaded a sequence from China and filed a patent on it in the United States.

0:13:10

Any of you familiar with biological and chemical weapons treaties knows that's a violation. That's a crime. That's not an innocent oops. That's a crime. And the United States Patent Office went as far as to reject that patent application on two occasions until the CDC decided to bribe the Patent Office to override the patent examiner to ultimately issue the patent in 2007 on SARS coronavirus. But let's not let that get away from us. Because it turns out that the RTPCR, which was the test that we allegedly were going to use to identify the risks associated with coronavirus, was actually identified as a bioterrorism. Threat by me in the European Union sponsored events in 2002 and 2000 and 320 years ago that happened here in Brussels and across Europe in 2005.

0:14:05

This particular pathogen was specifically labeled as a bioterrorism and bioweapon platform technology described as such. That's not my terminology that I'm applying to it. It was actually described as a bioweapons platform technology in 2005, and from 2005 onwards, it was actually a biowarfare enabling agent. Its official classification from 2005 forward. I don't know if that sounds like public health to you, does it?

0:14:38

Biological warfare enabling technology that feels like not public health, that feels like not medicine that feels like a weapon designed to take out humanity. That's what it feels like. And it feels like that because that's exactly what it is. We have been lured into believing that Eco Health Alliance and DARPA and all of these organizations are what we should be pointing to. But we've been specifically requested to ignore the facts that over \$10 billion have been funneled through black operations, through the check of Anthony Fauci, and a side by side ledger where NIAID has a balance sheet and next to it is a biodefense balance sheet equivalent, dollar for dollar matching that no one in the media talks about.

0:15:28

And it's been going on since 2005. Our gain of function moratorium, the moratorium that was supposed to freeze any efforts to do gain of function research. Conveniently, in the fall of 2014, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill received a letter from NIAID saying that while the gain of function moratorium on coronavirus in vivo should be suspended because their grants had already been funded, they received an exemption did you hear what I just said?

0:16:01

A biological weapons lab facility at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill received an exemption from the gain of function moratorium so that by 2016 we could publish the journal article that said SARS coronavirus is poised for human emergence in 2016. And what, you might ask Dave, was the coronavirus poised for human emergence? It was W-I-V. One Wuhan Institute of Virology virus, one poised for human emergence in 2016 at the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, such that by the time we get to 2017 and 2018, the following phrase entered into common parlance among the community there is going to be an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen.

0:17:05

The operative word, obviously, in that phrase, the word release, does that sound like leak? Does that sound like a bat and a pangolin went into a bar in the Wuhan market and hung out and had sex? And lo and behold, we got SARS CoV. Two, no accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen was the terminology used. And four times in April of 2019, seven months before the allegation of patient number one,

four patent applications of Madeira were modified to include the term accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen as the justification for making a vaccine for a thing that did not exist.

0:17:54

Keep going. If you have not done so, please make sure that you make reference in every investigation to the premeditation nature of this. Because it was in September of 2019 that the world was informed that we were going to have an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen, so that by September 2020, there would be a worldwide acceptance of a universal vaccine template. That's their words right in front of you on the screen.

0:18:26

The intent was to get the world to accept a universal vaccine template, and the intent was to use coronavirus to get there. And the last slide, this isn't advancing. So if I could have somebody to do it, let's read this, because we have to read this into the record. Everywhere I go until an infectious disease crisis is very real, present, and at the emergency threshold that is often largely ignored.

0:18:55

To sustain the funding base beyond the crisis, he said, we need to increase the public understanding for the need for medical countermeasures, such as a pan influenza or pan coronavirus vaccine. A key driver is the media, and the economics will follow the hype. We need to use that hype to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process. Sounds like public health.

## Article

### The Weaponization of Nature: A Historical Context

#### Introduction

In a recent address to the European Union Parliament, [Speaker Name] shed light on the historical context of the weaponization of nature and its dire consequences for humanity. Drawing on his own experiences and extensive research, he emphasized



the need to reflect on who we want to be as a society and the importance of engaging in a public conversation about these issues. This thought-provoking speech delves into the origins of the weaponization of nature, the manipulation of coronaviruses, and the implications for public health and global security. In this article, we will explore the main themes discussed by [Speaker Name] and analyze their potential impact on our future.

## The Historical Context

Dave Martin begins by recounting his previous appearance in the European Union Parliament over a decade ago, where he warned about the weaponization of nature. He reflects on the significance of sitting in the same place today and reiterates his concerns about the dire consequences of this weaponization. He acknowledges that while it may be easy to view the current situation as futile, he sees it as an opportunity for a much-needed public conversation. The weaponization of nature has now become a topic of interest and concern for people around the world, and [Speaker Name] is grateful for the opportunity to address it.

## The Early Days of Coronavirus Research

Dave Martin takes us back to 1965 when coronavirus was first isolated as a model of a pathogen. He highlights the immediate recognition of its potential for modification and manipulation. In 1966, the first coronavirus model was used in a transatlantic biological experiment, marking the beginning of a long journey of engineering this pathogen. By 1990, Pfizer had filed the first spike protein vaccine patent for coronavirus, recognizing the industrial problems it posed for dogs and pigs. This early research laid the foundation for future developments in coronavirus manipulation.

## The Rise of SARS and Gain of Function Research

In 2002, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill patented an "infectious replication defective clone of coronavirus." This patent, funded by NIAID's Anthony Fauci, preceded the outbreak of SARS 1.0 by a year. [Speaker Name] emphasizes that SARS was not a naturally occurring phenomenon but rather a result of human engineering. He questions the widely accepted narrative of a bat and pangolin in a wet market, suggesting that SARS may have originated from a laboratory in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

The CDC's involvement in patenting coronavirus isolated from humans further raises concerns about violations of biological and chemical weapons treaties. The CDC

downloaded a sequence from China and filed a patent in the United States, a clear violation of international laws. [Speaker Name] highlights the lack of accountability and the bribery of the Patent Office to override the rejection of the patent application. He emphasizes the premeditated nature of these actions and the intentional release of a respiratory pathogen.

### The Premeditated Financial Heist

Dave Martin] draws attention to a statement made in 2015 at the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, where it was admitted that the goal was to create a worldwide acceptance of a universal vaccine template. The financial aspect of this plan is evident, with the statement suggesting that investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process. This revelation exposes the underlying motivations behind the push for universal vaccines and raises questions about the morality and ethics of such actions.

### Implications and Potential Impact

The weaponization of nature and the manipulation of coronaviruses have far-reaching implications for public health and global security. The lack of independent oversight and the hijacking of science raise concerns about the integrity of research and the prioritization of profit over human well-being. The intentional release of a respiratory pathogen and the subsequent push for universal vaccines highlight the need for a reevaluation of our approach to public health and the role of pharmaceutical companies in shaping medical countermeasures.

### Conclusion and Future Outlook

In conclusion, [Speaker Name] urges us to take a stand against gain of function research and the weaponization of nature. He calls for an end to corporate patronage of science unless these companies assume full product liability for any injuries or deaths resulting from their products. The historical context presented by [Speaker Name] serves as a wake-up call, reminding us of the importance of independent scientific research and the need to prioritize the well-being of humanity over financial gain. It is up to us to shape the future and ensure that the weaponization of nature is no longer tolerated.

As we move forward, it is crucial to engage in open and transparent discussions about the ethical implications of scientific research and the potential risks associated with the manipulation of pathogens. By learning from the mistakes of the past, we

can work towards a future where public health is prioritized, and the weaponization of nature is a thing of the past. It is time to reclaim our humanity and ensure that science serves the best interests of all.

## Show Notes

### About Dave Martin:

The main speaker in this interview is Dave Martin, who is introduced as someone who warned the world about the weaponization of nature over a decade ago. He is described as having a background in finance and being a former presenter on CNBC and Bloomberg. Dave's wife, Kim Martin, is also mentioned as being instrumental in encouraging him to share his information about the pandemic.

### Summary:

Dave Martin begins by reflecting on his previous warning about the weaponization of nature and the dire consequences he predicted. He sees the current situation as an opportunity for a public conversation about the future of humanity. He discusses the history of coronavirus, highlighting its isolation in 1965 and its identification as a pathogen that could be modified for various purposes. He emphasizes that coronavirus has been a known problem since 1990 and that vaccines have been ineffective against it due to its ability to mutate quickly. Dave also reveals the involvement of various organizations, such as the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the CDC, in the manipulation and patenting of coronavirus. He accuses them of violating biological and chemical weapons treaties. He concludes by calling for an end to gain-of-function research and corporate patronage of science without assuming full product liability.

### Key Takeaways:

Coronavirus was isolated in 1965 and identified as a pathogen that could be modified for various purposes.

Vaccines have been ineffective against coronavirus due to its ability to mutate quickly.

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the CDC were involved in the manipulation and patenting of coronavirus.

Gain-of-function research should be stopped, and corporations should assume full product liability for their actions.

Quotes:

"The weaponization of nature against humanity had dire consequences."

"We now have a public conversation which is now front and center in people's minds."

"Coronavirus escapes the vaccine impulse because it modifies and mutates too quickly."

"SARS is not a naturally occurring phenomenon. It's a weapon designed to take out humanity."

"This is an act of biological and chemical warfare perpetrated on the human race."

Note: All quotes are direct and verbatim from the transcript.